

REMARKS

The office action of May 15, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-21 remain in this application. Claims 3 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been entered.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out a distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 such that claim 1 is now specifically directed to a computer system configured to implement a method. Thus, as per the office action at page 2, the claim language is directed to a method; the method itself takes place (e.g., is executed on) a computer system configured to implement the method. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the electronic and computer arts would appreciate that a computer system may be configured to (procedurally) execute the steps of a method. Thus, Applicants submit that in view of the amendment, the rejection to claim 1 has been rendered moot upon entry of the present paper. Moreover, the corresponding rejection to the dependent claims has been rendered moot by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 11 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method. Thus, as per the office action at page 2, claim 11 is directed to a method. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the electronic and computer arts would appreciate that the method, as recited in claim 11, may be embodied in a computer-readable medium, and that the computer-readable medium may include computer-executable instructions to facilitate execution of the method on a computer. In view of these remarks, Applicants submit that the rejection as applied to claim 11 has been rendered moot. Furthermore, the corresponding rejection to the dependent claims has been rendered moot by virtue of their dependence from claim 11.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that in view of the preceding remarks (regarding the rejections of the referenced claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112) that the corresponding 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection has been rendered moot as applied to all of the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0187808 to Alfred, et al. (“Alfred”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite features similar to those once appearing in now-cancelled claim 3. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

“determining a total cost estimate . . . wherein the total cost estimate is based on determining a total material cost for one or more products . . .”

As per the office action at page 5, Alfred fails to disclose the recited features. Thus, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to incorporate features similar to those recited in now-cancelled claim 13. Those features are similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Thus, claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims, by virtue of depending from at least one of claims 1 and 13, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Independent claim 21 recites:

“a third display portion configured to display graphical objects associated with generating a cost differential report associated with the material product and another predetermined bulk product.”

The office action at pages 6-7 relies on Alfred at Figure 8 to allegedly demonstrate the recited features. Applicants disagree with the Office's assertion. Alfred at paragraph [0062] and Figure 8 merely demonstrates a calculation of a total price being equated to a unit price (e.g., \$2.22) multiplied by a quantity (e.g., 500) requested. Alfred fails to disclose the generation of a cost differential report associated with material product and another predetermined bulk as recited in claim 21. Thus, claim 21 is allowable for at least these reasons.

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Reg. No. 38,800

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Dated: September 17, 2007